

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE EXPRESSED AIM OF THE LONG PROSE FICTION FROM 1579 TO 1740

At the present day few historians of literature adjudge Pamela to be the first of English "novels"; yet there seems to be a wide-spread belief that the theories put forth by Fielding and Richardson in their prefaces were new. A small fraction of their views may be. But, as a matter of fact, there is even before 1579 a considerable amount of critical comment upon prose fiction as distinguished from poetical.[1] And after 1579 there is so much material scattered in Spanish, French, and English prefaces to prose fictions, that the collector of such material is forced to cull and choose more than once before he selects the most telling remarks.[2] That such prefatory comment is not systematic "criticism" may be urged against it. There *is* systematic "criticism" in sufficiency—at least five long French treatises before 1735. But to me the real value of the comment upon prose fiction is that most of it *does* lie in prefaces, and thus represents a critical tradition allowed to go its own way, without much interference from Aristotles, Castelvetros, Boileaus, and Drydens. The comment, furthermore, extends in every direction—toward relations of fiction with the drama, toward characterization, toward background or setting, toward style, etc. Of it all perhaps not the least interesting phase is the statement by this or that author of his aim or, to use his own word, his "purpose" in composition. For these statements throw a great light upon both the content and structure of 17th and early 18th century fiction. Not, indeed, that I am claiming for the early fictionists either belief in or adherence to all their theor-

[1] I may here state that I have already collected this matter, and that it constitutes the first chapter in my doctoral dissertation, entitled: *The Expressed Theory Of European Prose Fiction before 1740.* The dissertation will be published shortly. The matter of the present article is drawn from my second chapter.

[2] In general, the quotations in this article are limited to French and English authors. After 1579 the Italian prefaces do not contain much material; Spanish fiction is of small importance outside of the *novella* and the picaresque tale; and the German prefaces copy the French.

ies. I merely insist that no author's place in the development of prose fiction can be determined without reference to his expressed opinions upon his work—a reference seldom made in regard to the pre-Richardsonians. For, as far as I know, Koerting's *Geschichte des Französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrhundert* is the sole exception to that high-handed method of modern histories of fiction, which takes for granted that the fictionist's theories are negligible.

Now, it is the entire thesis of a recent German study [3] that upon the type to which any fiction belongs, depends its author's aim, and, conversely, that through some individual author's aim, the type itself may undergo alterations of content and form. This is at least so far true that if we hasten to examine theory of the aim of fiction in general before 1740, we shall get nowhere. Instead, we shall do well to attempt to classify and define the numerous types of prose fiction in our period, and then to consider the expressed aims of fictionists. We shall act wisely, moreover, if we abandon any *a priori* classification of fiction, and follow the lines of division which authors themselves were drawing between types. Such a scheme will not always be consistent. Authors' ideas of types were not very consistent. But the classification will be convenient, and will have the merit of being true to the development of fiction. Accordingly, let us admit as separate types of prose fiction before 1740 the romance; the realistic narrative; the letter-novel; the *chronique scandaleuse;* the *voyage imaginaire;* and the *frame-work conte de fée.* Let us further be prepared to recognize seven types of romance, and four of the realistic narrative.[4]

[3] Dibelius, *Englische Romankunst,* Berlin, 1910.

[4] Two of the earliest attempts at classifying prose fiction are worth quoting. Charles Sorel in *La Bibliothèque Françoise* (1664; licensed 1659) writes (p. 149): "*Ces livres d'invention d'esprit sont sous la forme de Fables et d'Allégories, ou ce sont des Romans de Chevalerie, et de Bergerie, ou des romans vraisemblables, et des nouvelles, et des Romans Héroiques ou Comiques.*" d'Aubignac in the preface to *Macarise* (1664) recognizes fictions "*sur quelques notables circonstances de l'histoire*" (p. 126), works which "*doivent joindre le merveilleux au vraisemblable*" (146), and narratives which are "*quelques histoires de temps, tirées des cabales de la cour*" (149).

Obviously, for these terms careful definitions are needed, if we are to use them consistently throughout our discussion. By the general term, romance, then, is meant that form of the long prose fiction which has for its chief aim (often unexpressed) delighting the reader, which has a fairly unified structure, which is essentially grounded on both love and adventure, and which, above all, employs incidents, characters, machinery, setting, and style, such as, in type after type, were insistently satirized as untrue to life.[5] Under the genus romance may be distinguished (the names are self-explanatory) the chivalric romance, the pastoral romance, the allegorical romance, the religious romance, the heroico-historical romance, the informational-conversational romance, and the satirical romance.[6] By realistic narrative, as a term opposed to romance, is meant that form of the long prose fiction which has for its chief aim (often unexpressed) delighting the reader, which has a fairly unified structure, which emphasizes, in one species adventure, in another character, and which, above all, prides itself upon its depiction of historical or contemporary manners in a method which can seldom be satirized as untrue. Under the genus realistic narrative may be distinguished (again the names are self-explanatory) the picaresque tale, the novel of manners, the historical-psychological novel, and the psychological novel proper. By the *chronique scandaleuse*[7] is meant a series of indecent stories about historical or contemporary personages, which are told with a mali-

[5] In explaining just how this definition was arrived at, I may illustrate how I have used the material supplied by authors. The *chronique scandaleuse* and the *voyage imaginaire* have special purposes; the framework *conte de fée* is not based on love plus adventure, and has no unified structure; the letter-novel, also, has no unified structure; and, finally, the realistic narrative aimed to portray life as it is. That the forms are not quite mutually exclusive is not my fault, but the authors'.

[6] Koerting, *Geschichte des Französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrhundert,* classifies romances much as I have done. I subsume his political under my allegorical, however, since all the political romances were allegorical in one sense; and I add informational-satirical romances to his list. From Miss Morgan, *Rise of the Novel of Manners* (ch. I) I differ entirely. Such *nomenclature* as Arcadian, Euphuistic, or Classical, seems to me misleading.

[7] I borrow the title from Imbert's *Chronique Scandaleuse* (1791).

cious or lascivious aim, are loosely connected, are either real or fictitious in content, and are almost certain to introduce the supernatural. By the *voyage imaginaire* is meant a rather unified narrative, aiming specifically at literary criticism, at amusement through the introduction of the wildly fantastic, or at social improvement of the human race, and invariably carrying the reader into unexplored regions. By the frame-work *conte de fée* is meant a series of stories dealing with the supernatural and bound within a frame-work tale which motivates the whole series. Finally, by the letter-novel is meant a work either romantic or realistic, and having almost any "purpose," but constantly assuming a special type of structure—that of letters exchanged between two or more persons.

Having, then, defined our use of fictional type-names, let us turn to the expressed aims of prose fiction from 1579-1740. We shall find that the expressed aims of authors are five—if we are again willing to tabulate preface after preface. And these five aims are the amusement of the reader; his edification; his instruction; the depicting of the life about him; the attempt to arouse his emotions.[8] Were an author's expressed aim confined to any one of these, our problem would now be simple. Unfortunately, authors have complexes of aims, so that under each of the five "purposes" we must slowly bring, if not single fictional types, at best only groups of types at one and the same time.

Were a casual reader of early prose fiction to reason *a priori* upon the aim which an author would state in his preface, he would probably conclude that "amusement" would be stressed. In place of this, however, the authors are few who dared to confess what, aside from money or fame, must have been the true goal of a vast amount of fiction-writing—pleasing the public. The source of such reticence is worth seeking, for the reticence brought in its train a multitude of interesting

[8] What some might consider an aim of fiction—the unwearying effort to force the reader to believe the author's story—is not treated here, owing partly to lack of space, and partly to the fact that, in my judgment, this effort is more a method of working than a mere aim. The third of the eleven chapters of my book will be devoted to it.

consequences. It seems to me that the aim of amusing is in general unemphasized, not because of what is now-a-days called its "obviousness," but because the problem of the Renaissance, the "justification of imaginative literature," [9] bore heavily even to 1740 upon prose fiction. Since the Renaissance, imaginative literature as a whole had no longer to prove its right to exist by the parade of allegory or interpolated "sentence"; drama and epic had unshackled themselves. But the more one scans the clearly reactionary outbursts of such recalcitrants against morality as Hamilton in the *Memoirs of Grammont,* ponders over the attitude of the French Academy toward Furetière's "mean and low" *Roman Bourgeois,* skims the eight letters written against fiction by Nicole of the Port Royal in 1665, or eyes the apologies of Bunyan and of Lenglet-Dufresnoy (1734), one understands why the Spanish picaresque tales are full of digressive exhortations, why the huge German romances of Zesen and Bucholtz are strewn with praying heroes, and why the Abbé Prévost made his "*Homme de Qualité*" beg pardon for having in his pious old age produced the "amorous" tale of *Manon Lescaut.* Nowhere in Europe could one write prose fiction before 1740 without a mild blush of shame.[10]

Nevertheless, at times there were revolutionists who wished to see fiction free to entertain, and only to entertain. Sidney's much-quoted preface to the *Arcadia* [11] would seem to speak

[9] This is Spingarn's thesis in *Literary Criticism in the Renaissance.*

[10] I say this despite the applause given to Mlle. de Scudéry and others. Mlle.'s own words are significant (*Conversations sur Divers Sujets,* 1685, p. 48): "And I know several old senators here and even Roman matrons, to whom love would be so dreadful that they would even forbid their children to read a fiction of this kind." The conversation originally appeared in *Clélie,* Tome VIII (1654), which accounts for the mention of Rome.

[11] "Here have you this idle work of mine, which, I fear, like the spider's web, will be thought fitter to be swept away, than woven to any other purpose. Now, it is done only for you, only to you; if you keep it to yourself, or commend it to such friends who will weigh errors in the balance of good-will, I hope, for the father's sake, it will be pardoned... Your dear self can best witness the manner, being done in loose sheets of paper, most if it in your presence; the rest by sheets sent unto you, as fast as they were done." This preface seems to me to have been too

for romance; but Sidney stands alone amid a host of moralizing romancers. It is the frame-work *conte de fée* which revolts most boldly; likewise in the van, fighting openly or under shields not difficult to thrust aside, are the authors of picaresque narratives and of novels of manners. In the first group, that of the frame-work *conte de fée,* the Turkish Tales alone emphasize didacticism. If Gueullette incidentally mentions the morality "couched in" the *Tartarian Tales* (1723), his *Soirées Brétonnes,* his *Mogul, Chinese,* and *Peruvian Tales,* as well as Caylus's *Nouveaux Contes Orienteaux* (1735) make no other claim than "to treat of love innocent and legitimate," or "to prefer *le frivole amusant* to the things which one calls serious." [12]. The picaro-inventers are more difficult to follow. Thus much may be said of the extremes of this party. The English *Faustus-book* of 1587 is dismally serious in its asserted intention: "for here we have a wicked example of his writing, promise, and end, that we may remember him, that we go not astray." On the other hand, the *Wagner-book* of 1594, Nashe in *Jacke Wilton,* [13] d'Aubigné in *Les Aventures du Baron de Foeneste* (1617), and particularly Hamilton in the *Memoirs of Grammont* are heart and soul for "delight"; says Hamilton, "I declare that, without troubling myself about the severe erudition of these last (critics), I write only for the amusement of others." Between the moralizers and the "writers

much trusted. The *Arcadia* is altogether too coherent to have been written without some of Sidney's "loose sheets" being carefully related to rather remote predecessors. Cf. the prefaces quoted in this chapter, note 17.

[12] When these fairy-tales were translated into English, they were given highly moral prefaces. V. that to the *Peruvian Tales* (1734tr.), the *Tartarian Tales* (1759), the *Mogul Tales* (1736). One notes, too, that when J. K. completed the *Peruvian Tales,* he introduced an adventure (v. *Novelists' Magazine,* Vol. XXI, p. 190) which allowed him to give an allegorical explanation for some unseemly pages of Gueullette's own work.

[13] *Jacke Wilton,* pp. 72-73. Cf. Espinal's *Marcos de Obregon* (1618). The main purpose is: "*à aligerar por algun espacio, con alivio, y gusto, la carga que oprime los ombros de V. S. Illustrissima*".... But important minor aims immediately follow this: to teach morality, reverence to God, etc.

for amusement'' range the authors of the most important picaresque narratives, one and all apparently believers in Boccaccian advocacy of ''art for art's sake.'' [14] Aleman in Spain, e. g., when annoyed by a continuation of the *Guzman d'Alfarache,* will tell us that he aimed to describe a man who ''perfect in his parts and person, punished with troubles, and afflicted with miseries, and falling afterwards into the basest roguery, is put into the gallies.'' Let us bow silently to Aleman's moral zeal, and compare this sermon (preface to Pt. II) with the elaboration of the ''variety'' of his literary banquet for the reader (preface to Pt. I). Head in England will likewise show that his *English Rogue* (postscript to Vol. I) was to have been ''burnt in the London fire''; but a later passage (preface to Vol. III) casts into amusing relief such an exemplary intention: ''If any loose word have dropped from my pen, I would have the reader to pass it over regardless, and not, like a toad, only gather up the venom of a garden. However, very cautious I was in offending any modest ear (though sometimes it could hardly be avoided, the matter in a manner requiring it) because I look upon obscene expressions as the plague on paper; and he that comes between the sheets is in danger of being infected.'' [15] As for the last class of authors, those who write novels of manners, they seem also to have read Boccaccio. Greene's dedication to *Never Too Late* (1590) is a significant forerunner of Defoe's prefaces, and has its counterpart in substance before Sorel's *Polyandre* (1648) and Furetière's *Roman Bourgeois* (1666). ''Wherein,'' writes Greene, ''I

[14] V. the conclusion to the *Decameron,* and cf. the endings of such stories in Straparolla's *Notti Piacevolle* as II, 5; VII, 1; V, 2, etc.

[15] Cf. the prefaces to Sorel's *Francion* (1622), and to *Gil Blas.* Mabbe, prefacing a version of Cervantes's *Exemplary Novels* in 1640, contrasts strangely with the Spanish author in *his* remarks of 1613: "could I by any means suppose that these novels could excite any bad thought or desire in those who read them, I would rather cut off the hand with which I write them than give them to the public." Mabbe says: "I will not promise any great profit you shall reap by reading them; but I promise they will be pleasing and delightful." Fürst in his *Vorläufer der Modernen Novelle* (1897) naively accepts (p. 5) not only Cervantes's preface as token of his moral ardor, but even his title—*Novelas Exemplares!*

have discovered so artificially the fraudulent effects of Venus' trumperies and so plainly as on a platform laid open the prejudicial pleasures of love." Again, before the *Farewell to Folly,* he sighs: "Follies I term them (*Mamilia, Pandosto,* etc.) because their subjects have been superficial, and their intents amorous." The suggestive lines follow: "yet [were they] mixed with such moral principles, that the precepts of virtue seemed to crave pardon for all those vain opinions love set down in his periods." [16]

Naturally, besides admitting that entertainment was his sole or chief end, [17] an author could either remain severely silent or declare that amusement was a secondary aim. The expression of an incidental desire to entertain is frequent in the romance, [18] with the exception of the chivalric species; it is particularly voiced in the allegorical, informational, religious, and satirical romances. In 1636 Kingsmill Long thus prefaces Barclay's *Argenis* (1621): "It is so full of wise and politic discourses, and these so intermixed

[16] If any one who believes these prefaces of Greene will count the number of times "strange," "surprising," or "marvelous" creeps into the titles or dedications, I fancy he will change his opinion. The same remark applies to Defoe.

[17] Works which I have classed as psychological novels, but which show affiliations with the picaresque tales and with the novels of manners, can afford to be bolder than these latter; they aid a constant claim of "truth" by the assertion that they have been written for the delight of the author or an intimate friend. The prefaces of Marivaux to *Marianne* and to the *Paysan Parvenu*—taking the form, it is true, of the opening to the first chapter—are easily accessible. Less known are prefatory remarks to the *Aventures de....*(1713, by Marivaux?): "he wrote these adventures to amuse the lady whom he loved"; or to Mme. Tencin's *Comte de Comminge* (1735): "I have no other design in writing these memoirs of my life than to recall the smallest circumstances of my misfortunes, and to grave them still more deeply, if that is possible, upon my memory."

[18] The heroico-historical romances worked pleasure into their theory. V. Mlle. de Scudéry's *Conversations sur Divers Sujets, Amsterdam,* 1685, pp. 33-50. For the pastoral romance see the preface to the *Astrée.* For the informational-conversational romance see the *Euphues;* for the satirical the *Don Quixote* and the *Berger Extravagant* (1627). Bougéant in *Prince Fan-faredin,* a critique on fiction (1735), offers a peculiar defiance to the ordinary claim: "I detest romances, you know; I see that you love them; and I declare war against you."

and seconded with pleasing accidents, so extolling virtue and depressing vice that....every reader will be drawn by the delight of something in it, to read the whole." Before *Macarise* (1664), an allegory so profound that a preface of nearly 200 pages is necessary to explain it, the Abbé d'Aubignac admits (p. 120): "But I shall advise my readers that there are many little circumstances which do not at all contain allegory, and which are only necessary connections in the composition of the romance, or graces——" Bunyan in the "Apology" to *Pilgrim's Progress* becomes poetical:

> "They must be groped for, and be tickled, too,
> Or they will not be catch'd, whate'er you do."

Barclay says of the *Euphormio* (1610): "I have sought in all this pleasure and matter for laughter rather than solid and legitimate indictment [of vice]." Why, now, is the aim of amusement so freely confessed by the authors of these forms? The answer is evident. All the authors of this group have serious purposes. Yet a moralist like Camus must please in order to instruct, a hapless lover like Gombauld must conceal his affection for the lofty Marie de Medici under the plaints of Endymion for Diana and the pretence of "amusing the queen," the reformer of society like Fénélon or of literature like Bougéant must hypnotize before he can transform.

So much, then, for expression, complete or partial, of the desire to entertain. What of the types of fiction that in general sternly suppress any such claim—the chivalric romance of important authors, the *voyage imaginaire,* the historical novel, the *chronique scandaleuse?* No attentive reader need puzzle long. Assault upon the "frivolity" of the chivalric romance, particularly the *Amadis,* was the prevailing literary cry from about 1580; as a result, later authors of this form, notably in France, Spain, and Germany urged that they were merely desirous of "reforming" a "useful" kind of fiction. It is true that in England Sidney, Lodge, and Ford are silent about reform; but the great authors of the continent, Cervantes, du Verdier,[19] Gomberville, and Bucholtz, are much

[19] Cf. du Verdier, *Romans des Romans* (a continuation of the *Amadis*-cycle, 1624): "it is possible that you will still blame the design that I have made of finishing a work that you would judge little useful to

exercised. Gomberville seems to have grieved over having deepened the immoralities of the period (1632 seq.) by his publication of *Polexandre*—though, as a matter of fact, the reader of his romances observes that he transformed the "frivolous and foolhardy Amadis to a blameless, noble knight," and pictured the "perfect lover" as an "honorable man in every respect."[20] Bucholtz before *Hercules und Valiska* (1659) cries out: "That shamelessly-passionate Amadis-book has many lovers also among the women, of whom, however, none have been bettered through it, but instead several are urged to unbecoming boldness, when they see painted before their eyes such occurrences....I do not doubt that the excellent Barclay with his famous *Argenis;* Lord Sidney with his *Arcadia;* Marets with his *Ariana*...[who] have torn the Amadis out of the hands of youth....have not given the slightest incitement [to evil]....But the true fear of God is not introduced even in their books——therefore my mind and perhaps others are not satisfied with these. At least the reader is herewith warned in Christian wise not to read the book in such a way that he take out only the worldly events for his mental delectation and wish to pass over the intermingled spiritual things [*Sachen,* i. e. prayers, etc?]. If, however, the motive which kept the chivalric romance from asserting amusement as its goal was a desire for reform, no such

posterity; but if you could know my thoughts, you would draw an excellent fruit from an earth so unfruitful, you would find there an example for virtuous living, and living in the mode (*bienséance*) of the world, you would know how necessary it is to love holily, and seeing the misfortunes which often indeed are born from an unregulated love, without doubt you would encounter ways to retire yourself from this precipice." It is inexact for Baker to write in the preface to his edition (1907) of Sidney's *Arcadia*: "The pastoral novel and the Amadis cycle of romances were the two direct progenitors of Sidney's *Arcadia,* in which the spirit of knightly heroism and the idyllic atmosphere of a sentimental Utopia are blended in fairly equal parts"; and for Raleigh in his *English Novel* (p. 90)to speak of the true love of the chivalric romances *degenerating* to gallantry in the romances of the seventeenth century. For in the *Amadis* and the *Palmerin* cycles reigns a care-free licentiousness.

[20] The lines quoted are from Koerting, *Geschichte des Französischen Romans im 17ten Jahrhundert,* Vol. 1, p. 217).

cause can be advanced for the reticence of the *voyage imaginaire* or that of the historical novel. These sought to be believed verbatim; consequently, pleasure for the reader was not in point. The Utopian travels were apparently of deadly serious aim; and, though the *Voyages* of Cyrano de Bergerac must have *amused* readers, Lebret, their editor (1656-1662), exhausts himself in proving other merits. Quite alone in daring, accordingly, are the prefaces to such little-known volumes as *Travels through Terra Australis Incognita* (1684), *A Voyage to the World of Cartesius* (1692), and *Lamekis* (1735); perhaps one might add the preface to *Pt. I* of *Robinson Crusoe*. Daniel, if he be the author of the *World of Cartesius,* hits hard at philosophic mysteries, but he cannily fishes for readers: "I have made it my business to diversify and enliven a subject naturally dry and melancholy, as well by the variety of accidents, which give me occasion to digress upon them, as by some peculiar and not incurious instances of the history of Cartesianism."[21] The prefaces of the historical novelists are very similar to those of the average *voyageur*. Sandras, e. g., a prolific author from 1686-1705, emphasizes in *Rochefort* his moral aim, in the *Memoirs of d'Artagnan* his desire to honor that bold Gascon, in *Coligny* his yearning to give information accessible only to him; but everywhere he wants to secure credence. The *chronique scandaleuse,* now, is the sole form left to consider. But is a shameless narrative of scandal ever actuated save by vehement fervor to reform one's contemporaries? Bussy-Rabutin, indeed, ventures to preface the *Histoire Amoureuse des Gaules* (1660) with "I engaged myself in writing a history or rather a satirical *roman,* truly without design of injuring the interested parties but only to occupy myself and...to give pleasure." The usual *chronique scandaleuse* (perhaps remembering Bussy's incarceration in the Bastille) ventures no such risk. The *Mémoires de la Comtesse de M...* (1697) is written in reply to the equally odorous *Mémoires de la Vie du Comte de...* (1696). Mrs. Manley, attacked by the *Tatler* for the malevolence and prurience of the *New Atalantis* (1709), defends her-

[21] Cf. with these statements the prefaces of *Jaques Sadeur* (1676), *The Sevarambians* (1675), or *Gaudentio de Lucca* (1727).

self by "the precedent of our great forefathers in satire," and by the declaration that "whoever is withheld by the consideration of fear, danger, spiteful abuses, recriminations, or the mean hopes of missing pity, has views too dastardly and mercenary for lofty, steadfast souls, who can be only agitated by true greatness, by the love of virtue, and the love of glory." [22]

With such citations as have been given concerning the attitude of authors toward the aim of amusement one might continue indefinitely. The purpose of edification—the second on our list—needs closer analysis. But first let us consider briefly the effect of the aim of amusement upon narrative structure.

It is at once evident that, where differing attitudes toward amusement were present, differing results are observable.[23] From the group of narratives which openly confessed that their *chief* desire was to delight the reader, came the most incoherent fictions: *Jack Wilton, Simplicissimus,* the *English Rogue,* the *Roman Bourgeois,* the *Peruvian Tales.*[24] As regards the group which subordinated the announcement of "delight" to declaration of a moral aim, but which yet expressed entertainment as a minor end, two effects are seen: on the one hand, the moral aim tended to unify the more important picaresque tales, the heroic romances, and such works as *Pilgrim's Progress;* on the other, "delight" militated against edifying and informational digressions. Finally, in the group which heroically repressed the cry of amusement as a bait to readers,

[22] Preface to *New Atalantis,* Vol. III, written in answer to the Tatler for Nov. 10, 1709. V., also, the same lady's *Memoirs of Europe at the Close of the 8th Century,* wherein (p. 234), when Horatio objects to Girron's malignant gossip, Girron answers calmly, "If we speak of 'em, we must speak of 'em as they are." Mrs. Manley's real aim appears, it seems to me, in (p. 1): "Our design is to treat of rough Bellona's formidable charms; Mars dreadfully gay....But to take in and complete our circle with the lovely sex....we shall not forbear to introduce the queen of love."

[23] In this and the following short accounts of the relation of purpose to content and structure completeness is not aimed at. The more important effects are suggested.

[24] The *Peruvian Tales* is included here because it is nearer to being a unified narrative than many a work which passes as a novel of manners. In its 218 pages are but two stories, one left unfinished!

the zeal for reform changed the entire character of the chivalric romance, the effort to force belief cast the *voyage imaginaire* into the mould of the "autobiography," and satirical intention allowed to the *chronique scandaleuse* lasciviousness of material and disregard of form.

As a foreword to an account of the expression of the "moral purpose" among prose fictionists before 1740 no more appropriate quotation can be found than one from any of Defoe's numerous prefaces; the modest lines concerning the *Life and Adventures of Duncan Campbell* (1720) will serve. The author, we learn (p. 206), has "ended all the merriest passages with a sober, instructive, and edifying moral." On the necessity for a "sober" moral, however, all the types of prose fiction are so thoroughly in accord that we need not consider, as in the case of the aim of amusement, the attitude of each type. We need merely classify the species and subspecies of the edifying purpose. The species may be called the social aim, the religious aim, and the moral aim proper.

The movement for social reform exhibits two minor phases not without interest. The humanitarianism of Dickens, e. g., is at least once forestalled—and that, oddly enough, by Defoe. [25] An aim more often stated is the establishment of a

[25] Preface to *Colonel Jacques* (1722): "Here's room for just and copious observations on the blessings and advantages of a sober and well-governed education....also how much public schools and charities might be improved——the miserable condition of unhappy children." Abuse of the conditions in schools is found at least as early as *Francion* (1622), from which salient passages are given in Koerting, Vol. II, 54-57, and in Bréton, *Le Roman au 17ème Siècle,* pp. 66-74; I think, however, both these commentators do not allow for Sorel's fondness for satire—let truth fare as she may. Dibelius, *Englische Romankunst,* (*Band* I, 35-43), regarding Defoe as an isolated phenomenon, gives him, I think, entirely too much credit for serious efforts at reform....Apart from this one phase of the social purpose, may be mentioned here a seeming desire to present in humanitarian fashion the distress arising from forced marriages or cloistral immurement of daughters for economic reasons, a demand that slaves be better treated, and an onslaught upon dueling. Forced marriages and cloistral immurement are, according to Reynier, (*Le Roman Sentimental avant L'Astrée,* ch. X.) the motifs of a group of novels from 1590-1610. *Lydamant et Calliante* (1607) has: "Girls are slaves of their condition, miserable in that they have no choice in the matter most dependent upon their choice," and *Martyre d'Amour* (1603): "Behold

close relationship between the purpose claimed by satirical comedy, and that asserted by the novel of manners. As early as the *Gyges Gallus* (158?)[26] and Sorel's *Francion* (1622) this bond had been hinted at. In the *Roman Bourgeois* it is fully voiced: "I can assure you that it has not been made only for diversion, but that its first design has been to instruct... there have been very few who censure ordinary faults, which are so much more dangerous as being more common [than great vices]....Does one not see every day an infinity of drunkards, bores, misers, pettifoggers, braggarts, flirts male and female? Nevertheless, has there been any who dares to advise them of their faults and of their follies, if it has not been comedy or satire? They, leaving to the learned and to magistrates the care of combatting crimes, halt at the correcting of

here the flame of the mortuary torches which paternal cruelty has all too miserably enkindled." I can not evaluate these aims, because I have not been able to see these works. On the next topic, the demand that slaves be better treated, I am better informed. The demand is heard chiefly in Mrs. Behn's *Oroonoko* (1688) and in Mrs. Aubin's *Noble Slaves* (1722). Mrs. Behn, I am sure, is not in earnest, despite Cross, (*The English Novel,* p. 20), who calls Oroonko "the first humanitarian novel." Mrs. Aubin really seems to mean: "We can not think without horror of the miseries that attend those, who in countries where the monarchs are absolute, and standing armies awe the people, are made slaves to others." As for the attacks upon dueling, the assaults of Barclay's *Euphormio* (v. Koerting, Vol. II, 9; 22) and Camus's *Cléoreste* (v. Koerting, Vol. I, 198) preceded Henry IV's edict against dueling in 1627. The *Nova Solyma* (1648) assails the practice (Vol. I, 298-299). Later remarks of importance are to be found in the *Mémoires de la Vie du Conte D....*(1696), Vol. II, p. 84, and in Prévost's *Homme de Qualité* (Vol. V, p. 256). Fénélon, of course, wrote *Telemachus* (1699) partly that he might embody his views upon dress, furniture, architecture, etc.

[26] The *Gyges Gallus,* a mixture of character book and novel of manners, has a hero who in the preface regards his aim as novel; having gained the ring of invisibility, he writes: "as soon as, being received everywhere, I shall have known the customs, ridiculous and even criminal of my century, I shall write them." But the *Gyges Gallus* lacks plot. The *Francion* (1622), which has plot, carries on the movement: "In it are only naive descriptions of the vices of some men, and of all their faults....or of some trickeries of others." Cf. also the prefaces to *Polyandre* (1648), which exhibits six Parisian types, to *la Vie du Comte D....*(1696), which presents forty or more feminine types as mistresses of the hero, and to Crébillon's *Comte de Meilcœur* (1735).

indecencies and of ridiculousness. They are not less necessary and are often more useful than all the serious discourses and as an excellent portrait demands our admiration, though we do not recognize it for the person portrayed, in the same way one can say that fictitious narratives well-written and under assumed names make more impression upon our mind than the true names and the true adventures could make."

But the most significant movement toward social reform centered about the *voyage imaginaire*: from at least as early as 1675 a feeling that the ideal man is the man unspoiled by civilization may be traced. The hermaphrodites among whom *Jaques Sadeur* (1676) finds unstained innocence, the peaceable race of the land of the *Sevarambians* (1675), the charming sun-worshippers described in *Gaudentio de Lucca* (1726), the odd peoples whom *Le Nouveau Gulliver* (1728) encounters—all these offer evidence. The author of *Jaques Sadeur,* it is true, preserves a cautious silence in his *preface; Vairasse,* in general most careful not to offend Catholicism, speaks boldly only once in the *Sevarambians;* and Berington (if Berington wrote *Gaudentio de Lucca*) seldom drops his seemly mask of a MS found in the annals of the Inquisition. Desfontaines, on the other hand, does not mince words in the introduction to his *Nouveau Gulliver*: "One will see there the censure of all the policed nations, in the mouth of a virtuous savage, who knows only natural reason and who finds that that which we call civilization (*société civile*), polish, manners, is only a vicious commerce, which our corruption has invented and which our prejudice makes us esteem." [27]

[27] Various other citations will show how wide-spread the admiration for the natural man was before Rousseau. "For this people always keep a good guard on their frontier, as being apprehensive that strangers may come, and by ill examples corrupt their innocence, disturb their tranquility, and introduce vice and wickedness among them" (*Sevarambians,* p. 202). "And their manner of living....may pass for a perfect image of the state of man in full possession of natural happiness upon the earth" (*Jaques Sadeur,* preface). "And these people represented to me an absolute idea of the first state of innocence, before man knew how to sin; and 'tis most evident and plain, that simple nature is the most harmless, inoffensive, and virtuous mistress. 'Tis she alone, if she were permitted, that better instructs the world than all the invention of man; Religion would here but destroy that tranquility they possess by ignor-

Just as we allowed Defoe to introduce not only the subject of the edifying aim in general, but also the narrower topic of the "social purpose," so we may let him be herald for the religious aim. The grief with which he regards abridged editions of *Robinson Crusoe* is piteous; but as early as the *Storm* (1704) he had avowed: "The main inference I shall pretend to make—in this case, is, the strong evidence God has been pleased to give in this terrible manner to his own Being." Usually, the religious claim assumes one of two forms: the praise by the author of such pious monotheism as is injected, e. g., into the *Cythereé of Gomberville* (1638) and the *Adriatische Rosemunde* of Zesen (1645), or the setting up of militant sectarianism. [28] Back of the terrifying mass of Ingelo's *Bentivolio and Urania* (1660) is a preface of many pages, inculcating devotion to reformed religion. Nor were the Catholics silent. No less a personage than the Abbé Prévost governed much of his work by a desire to instill Christian tenets.[29]

ance; and laws would but teach 'em to know offences, of which they have now no notion" (*Oroonoko,* pp. 79-80). V. also Montesquieu's *Lettres Persanes,* letters X-XIV, giving the history of the Troglodytes; the account of the Abaqui in Prévost's *Cleveland,* Vol. II, 203 seq. (1769 ed.) and Léonore's conversation with Jaime in *Comte de Warwick* (1704), Vol. II, p. 38.

[28] By far the most curious of these special pleadings is the *Avantures de Madona et Francis d'Assisi,* the author of which is an exile after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the preface is remarkable alike for a wish to gain converts, and if necessary, to retail nastiness. The author writes to Charles XII: "provided that your Majesty find pleasure therein, let the Vatican growl, let it thunder, let it fulminate, I shall trouble myself little. Perhaps even as these adventures divert your Majesty, they will cause to be born the thought of imitating the zeal of the great Gustavus, and the desire of reducing to reason the enemies of your state"; further on, he adds: "To complete the confusion of the Papacy by itself, it has come into my mind to render public among the Protestants the life of its principal saints, and to give this work a novelistic form (*air de roman*), in order not to tire the reader, and to make more impressive the ridiculousness and the falsity of the things which are reported by the legendaries."

[29] V. the prefaces to the *Homme de Qualité,* to *Cleveland,* and to the *Doyen de Killerine.* The last is the most significant; *Cleveland* has been attacked on various grounds, and in the preface to the *Doyen de Killerine* (1735-1740) Prévost defends himself by pointing out that Cleveland

Dofoe has headed the quotations which vouch for the "social" and religious pretensions of authors; he might well lead the citations for the third species of claim, that of the moral purpose proper. But with this topic our problem increases greatly in complexity; still closer analysis of authors' assertions is necessary, or we shall not understand the effect of these assertions upon narrative technique. For in the moral field the use of characters as examples, good and bad, aroused a continuous tempest; the life-story of an improving or degenerating hero grew popular; volumes were written solely to illustrate certain virtues; the insertion into a story of moral comments was debated *pro* and *con;* chastity of language was defended and assailed.

The value claimed for example is perhaps the most common testimony of authors to their moral aims. The title of Greene's *Mirrour of Modestie* is characteristic both of him and of the plea; "wherein," he tells us, "appeareth as in a perfect glass how the Lord delivereth the innocent from all imminent perils, and plagueth the blood-thirsty hypocrites with deserved punishments. Shewing that the gray heads of doting adulterers shall not go with peace into the grave, neither shall the righteous be forsaken in the day of trouble." [30] This citation, moreover, aptly suggests an issue old as the world perhaps; certainly as old as fiction. Are not gray-headed adulterers and their like better banished from the realms of so formative a power as fiction?

On the affirmative side of this question were marshaled in

had struggled to attain morality, unsupported by a creed, until—"it is in the conversations with that illustrious friend that he finds peace of heart, and true wisdom with the perfect recognition of religion." "Such," he adds, "is the plan of the *English Philosopher.*" In the *Doyen de Killerine* one notes that Georges goes to destruction as a result of "natural religion." Cf. also *Homme de Qualité,* Vol. II, pp. 50-52 (ed. 1769). Mrs. Aubin's preface to the *Count de Vinevil* must also be considered.

[30] Cf. Mrs. Haywood, preface to *Memoirs of an Island Adjacent to Utopia* (1725). How smirkingly she writes (*ibid.,* Vol. II, p. 126): "Example has infinitely more power than precept to sway the mind of man either to good or ill."

France, d'Urfé, Gerzan,[31] Gomberville, and other romancers; and in England the anonymous author of the *Nova Solyma* goes as far as the writer of any modern Sunday-school story. The unwieldy volumes of the *Nova Solyma* (1648) are pre-eminently pure; the purpose is candidly told (Vol. I, p. 300): "The argument of this book is the history of a life that is free, that has received a liberal education, and has been well and religiously brought up; it keeps within the bounds of the humanly possible, and deals, as a rule, with the middle class." The brief for the negative of the issue contained, as might be surmised, a variety of defenses. Advocates of "art for art's sake," and using all the grinning apologies of Boccaccio and Bandello, were Aleman, Head, Quevedo,[32] etc.; the dropping of all pretense of a moral purpose we have seen in Hamilton's *Memoirs of Grammont* (1709), and we find it more startingly proclaimed in a genuine predecessor of Zola, *Des Challes.* In 1713 he pleads thus before *Les Illustres Françaises* for "*une morale plus naturelle.*" "Here are, I believe, a good part of the occurrences which are ordinarily found in the world; and the moral that one can draw from them is so much the more sensible, as it is founded upon certain facts." On a quite different tack in the defense of the "horrible example" are Du Verdier, whom we have quoted (note 19) as a friend of the *Amadis,* and Furetière, who struck deeper than he knew in assailing the *Astrée.*[33] Notwithstanding, it was in the reli-

[31] Preface to *Sofonisbe* (1627): "In the same way it is necessary to take care that the amours one treats of shall be so chaste and so honorable that they can not displease the most delicate ears." Some of Gerzan's situations, however, incline the reader to qualify this assertion a trifle.

[32] Preface to Pt. I of Aleman's *Guzman* (1599): "That which thou shalt find less grave or discomposed, presents itself in the person of a picaro, which is the subject of this book. Such things as these....sport thyself with them....and afterwards shake hands." The French translation (1648) of Quevedo's *Historia del Buscon llamado don Pablos* (1596) has a preface wherein the "Spanish Sharper" defends himself before the gods!

[33] Furetière's defense of the *Amadis* (preface to *Roman Bourgeois*) is singularly like Lamb's plea for the Restoration dramatists: "*Tel entre ceux-la est l'Astrée, puis il exprime naturellement les passions amoureuses, et mieux elle s'insinuent dans les jeunes âmes, ou il se glisse un*

gious romances of Camus that a legitimate—and modern—line of defense was developed. For Camus, I think, means every word he utters when he says: "If I dig in the ordures of the world, if I represent evil actions and even unchaste ones (*déshonnètes*), although very rarely, in order to make them detested, and through bloody invectives which I make against vice purge the world of its corrupt manners, why will any one blame this labor?" [34] The sole advance upon this view before 1740 is Prévost's comment upon *Manon Lescaut* (1732): "But experience is not an advantage which ought to be free to all the world to give itself; there remains then only example which can serve as a rule."

The use of the good or bad character as an example easily

venin imperceptible, qui a gagné le cœur qu'on puisse avoir pris du contrepoison. Ce n'est pas comme ces autres romans ou il n'y a que des amours des princes et des palladins qui, n'ayant rien de proportionée avec les personnes de commun, ne les touchent point, et ne font point naître d'envie de les imiter."

[34] *Cléoreste,* Vol. II, p. 720, ed. 1626. I do not agree with Koerting (Vol. I, p. 205) when he questions the sincerity of Camus's moral aim. It is true that this position is difficult to determine. We find before his *Singular Events* (162?; tr. 1639) a preface suggestive of the extreme stand of the purists: "The enterprise which I have taken in hand, is to encounter with those frivolous books, which may all be comprised under the name of romants (he includes the Italian *novelle*)....O why hath not my pen the virtue to cure the wounds that these wicked books cause the world....It makes me fear a labor like unto that of Danaides By what manner do I labor to overcome my adversaries? It is by diversion, setting relations true and beneficial...." On the opposite, we find within the *Singular Events* some *novelle,* more gruesome than any I have ever read, the *Curried Lovers,* e. g. Is Camus, then, a Greene or Defoe? It seems to me that the 100 pages of defense before *Agatonphile* (1623), the passage quoted from *Cléoreste,* and another from *Aristandre* (1624): "David committed two sins of horror, adultery and homicide, which are those which play most part in this German history," bear the accent of sincerity. Let the reader note the difference between these frank remarks, and an English lie (Head's *Art of Wheedling,* 1675): "consider Brutus and his confederates are not forgot in Livy; Sinon lives in Virgil and Pandarus in Homer; there is a Lais memorable in Corinth and a Lamia in Athens, and why should we not match those rampant whores with a pair of as lusty rogues?" Cf. also the prefaces to such works as Mme. de Villedieu's *Annales Galantes* (167?) or Jane Barker's *Exilius* (1715).

passed into the presentation of a life-story. The creators of picaros are again to the front; smilingly they inform us that they had doomed their heroes—were it not for ill-mannered and ill-moraled sequels from *other* hands—to end in the galleys (*Guzman d'Alfarache*) or in a holocaust (*English Rogue*) or in dire distress (*Roxana.*) The claim for a less piquant procedure, the slow unshackling of a sin-bound nature, is manifest in *Gil Blas* (1715-1735) and in Crébillon's *Comte de Meilcœur* (1735). Le Sage's parable about the two scholars of Salamanca, given in the preface to *Gil Blas,* is accepted as good moral coin by such an investigator as Bréton;[35] be that as it may, Gil's comments upon himself are worthy of notice. For Gil is not of the Spanish fraternity of picaros. He falls reluctantly; as late as Vol. II, p. 70, he is "shocked by....faults; but by misfortune I found a little too much to my taste their fashion of living, and I plunged myself into debauchery"; finally, at the close of the tale, he settles down, reformed.[36] As for Crébillon, his theory, since he had considerable influence, is more interesting than his assigned motive is trustworthy. The *Comte de Meilcœur* was never finished by its author; but he stated as his thesis the regeneration of a man, who through ignorance of that which is really worth while, becomes proud and debauched, and is only saved from this deadly condition by love for "*une femme estimable.*"

Example and life-story were not the sole resources of the moral-loving writers of fiction. At times books were written to exploit special virtues. Greene pens triumphantly: "*Penelope's Web,* wherein a crystal mirror of feminine perfection represents to the views of every one those virtues and graces, which more curiously beautifies the mind of women, than either sumptuous apparel, or jewels of inestimable value: the one buying fame with honor, the other breeding a kind of delight, but with repentance. In three several discourses also are three special virtues....pithily discussed: namely, Obedience, Chastity, and Silence." Camus, among others, declares some interesting moral campaigns: "*La Mémoire de Darie* (1620),

[35] *Le Roman au 18ème Siècle,* p. 39-40.

[36] Paris, 1810 ed. Cf. *Gil Blas,* Vol. III, p. 101; III, 155; IV, 16; IV, 83.

"where one will see the pattern (*idée*) of a devoted life and a religious death"; *Palombe* (1624), "concerning the purity of marriage and the honoring of a model wife"; *Cléoreste* (1626), "the image of a perfect friendship, crowned and concluded with a holy alliance between some French and Spanish [lovers]."

A fourth device of the moral aim, the insertion of comments by the author or by a character used as the author's mouthpiece, gradually met with disfavor. *Euphues* illustrates this sand-bagging method carried to an extreme. The well-known "caveat," even though it follows the *Euphues* proper, is at least attached to Lyly's narrative; accordingly, the reader of *Euphues* feels that he is neglecting his duty, if he ignores the admonition (p. 259): "And calling to mind his former looseness, and how in his youth he had misspent his time, he thought to give a caveat to all parents, how they might bring their children up." The introduction to the *Euphues* also furnishes cheerful proof as to why no one dares to classify this volume under any one of the types of prose fiction. "These discourses," riddles Lyly, "I have not clapped in a cluster, thinking with myself that ladies had rather be sprinkled with sweet water, then washed, so that I have sowed them here and there, like strawberries, not in heaps, like hops." Later, in the picaresque narratives of Spain, in Barclay's *Argenis* (1621), and in Sorel's *Francion* (1622), this sand-bagging method is similarly, if less alliteratively, expounded; but Sorel remarks: "there are some remonstrances, which, although they are short, will not fail to touch the soul vividly." That "short" is important as paving the way for a reform in structure, most clearly indicated in Le Sage's preface to his translation of *Guzman d'Alfarache;* he censures that work thus: "But the author ought to restrain himself from these ingenious sermons (*leçons*), which Persius calls with perfect truth '*une règle qui trompe,*' and not cut at every moment the thread of the adventures of his hero, in order to throw himself into long harangues against manners." After this advance, it is disappointing to find that in England the glib Defoe should have emphatically approved a method of composition detrimental to coherence: "this makes the abridging of this work

(*Robinson Crusoe*) as scandalous as it is knavish and ridiculous seeing....they strip it of all those reflections, as well religious as moral, which are not only the greatest beauty of the work, but are calculated for the infinite advantage of the reader.'' [37]

Defoe, however, is not only connected with this fourth way in which ''moral purpose'' voiced itself—the insertion of edifying comments; he is far down the line of a band of crusaders, seeking purity of phrase—the last moral claim of the fictionists which we shall consider. Just what motive lay behind this particular movement one can but ponder. In any event, quite aside from the dubious cleanliness of speech, which was advocated by Sorel, Head, and Defoe,[38] and which needs no further attention, there is such a movement. Lyly is honest in saying: ''For this I have diligently observed, that

[37] *Robinson Crusoe,* Vol. II, preface (1719 ed.). The *Nova Solyma* (1648) extols the romance for allowing digressions, and Ingelo in the *Bentivolio and Urania* (1660) and Boyle in *Theodora and Didymus* (1686) revel in the scope for preaching afforded by a pious purpose. In France, also, Brémont, an earlier translator of Guzman, considers it a merit to say: "*J'ai ajouté de petites façons.*" On the other hand, Espinal in the *Marcos de Obregon* (1618) had anticipated Le Sage by writing: "We ought never to stick too closely to dry doctrinal points, or give too great a loose to the play of the imagination; morality may be introduced under pleasing colors, and doctrine also be blended with delight"; and Sorel remarks upon *Guzman* in his *Bibliothèque Françoise* (1664), p. 172: "it is true that one has restrained the moral discourses which seem too long for this sort of book" (is this a reference to a translation of 1647? I found this idea of revision in the preface to a 1647 tr. of *Guzman d'Alfarache,* which had been bound into the preface of Vol. XI of *Cléopatre,* 1654 ed.) Care should be taken not to attribute to Le Sage a strict theory of unity. He is not opposed to narrative digressions, for he follows the quotation already cited by: "It is true that Mateo is sometimes too concise. If he elaborates almost always.... when he moralizes, he deducts for that from his comic actions, which he recounts too succinctly."

[38] V. *Moll Flanders,* preface: "The pen employed in finishing her story and making it what you now see it to be, has had no little difficulty to put it into a dress fit to be seen....to wrap it up so clean as not to give room, especially for vicious readers, to turn it to his disadvantage"; or *Roxana*: "all imaginable care has been taken to keep clear of indecencies." Mrs. Aubin before *Lady Lucy* (1726) and Mrs. Barker before *Exilius* (1715) have similar apologies.

there shall be nothing found, that may offend the chaste mind, with unseemly terms or uncleanly talk." D'Urfé's words are true in: "and be assured, my dear Lignon, that they (Diana and her nymphs) will find there no single thought that can offend their chaste and modest ears" (l'Astrée, preface to Pt. III). The boast:

"No word obscene, no phrase lascivious,
You here shall read, to taint a virgin's blush,"

is almost the sole merit of Baron's *Honor's Academy* (1645).[39] Not, indeed, until the stately edifice of heroico-historical romance tottered, and the *mémoire secrète,* like some vermin, crept from the ruins, did malicious nastiness of phrase and scene replace the "propriety" of the "princely" fictions.[40]

[39] With the first blush of shame by the ladies of the Decameron—so easily forgotten—should be compared the very vigorous reproofs administered to a French Dioneo by the ladies of *Mariane du Filomène* (1596). The English version of the Decameron in 1620 softens the frank diction of the stories of Dioneo on days three and nine. Baudoin's *Diversitez Historiques* (1620) has not a single unchaste line or situation. Boyle's *Theodora and Didymus* (1686) is scrupulously delicate in delineating a stew and its victims. The preface to *Pandion and Amphigeneia,* however (1665), is untrustworthy. So it goes through the century.

[40] Since a taking of prefaces at face value has somtimes led to a miscomprehension of the author's attitude, it has seemed worth while to append my feeling upon the trustworthiness of the edifying claims of the more important authors. The social and religious aims may in general be accepted as valid. In the case of the moral aim proper the following writers seem to me double-tongued: in England Greene, Head, Kirkman, Defoe, Mrs. Manley, and Mrs. Haywood; in France Sorel, Furetière, Sandras, and Crébillon; in Spain Aleman, Quevedo, and Perez. With reservations the following may be trusted: in England Mrs. Behn, Mrs. Barker, and Mrs. Aubin; in France Le Sage and Marivaux; in Spain Cervantes. Other important authors are in general sincere. As for minor writers the text or special notes furnish information....Let me illustrate, however, how dangerous it is to quote a preface by itself. In a monograph by Stanglmaier upon Jane Barker he lauds her high moral aim, and quotes her preface to *Exilius* as a proof. Now, Stanglmaier overlooks two points to be taken into consideration: one, of course, the book itself; the other, the type of preface popular in 1715. Mrs. Aubin, Mrs. Butler, and Mrs. Hearne all use similar prefaces; I regard them all as dubious. Again, Clodius's attitude within the volume (a) toward the siren's wife (p. 245), and (b)

How far, the reader is now probably asking, do all these quotations about moral aims bear upon the development of prose fiction? Many implications the reader only slightly acquainted with 17th century narrative will discover for himself.[41] Three effects of theorizing, nevertheless, are so important as to demand more attention than was allotted to the results brought about by the aim at amusement. The desire to picture Utopias, for instance, exercised a disintegrating influence upon all the important *voyages imaginaires.* Without exception, the *New Atlantis, Jaques Sadeur,* the *Sevarambians, Gaudentio de Lucca, Le Nouveau Gulliver* are broken by digressions germane to the purpose of composition. Another factor, too, though at first it is less evident, aided this incoherence. In order to reform, the *voyage imaginaire* sought to be believed, and thus, in general, passed as being edited from a MS, often fragmentary. In more than one case, accordingly, prefaces and notes cite breaks in the text as conclusive proof that the narratives are authentic. Responsibility for form, of course, rested nowhere.

A second important effect upon fiction was brought about by postulating a relation of the structure of fiction to that of comedy. Comedy had, in satirizing, represented life as it is. Fiction, then, was also to represent life as it is; and the inevitable outcome was that, on the one hand, the "novels of manners" were often inchoate, and that, on the other, they compensated for this defect by becoming true ancestors of the local-color ephemeræ of our own day. The latter service was one which we need not dwell upon in the period of Gomberville and Mlle. de Scudéry. Moreover, when occasionally a writer chose to present life from the point of view of *one* man

toward Libidina (p. 282) are suggestive of several things—among them the value of Mrs. Barker's "high" moral aim. Miss Morgan, too, (*Novel of Manners,* p. 113), seems to accept as true Mrs. Barker's declaration that she is imitating *Telemachus*—a bare faced-lie.

[41] The use of references to authorities at the side of the text, e. g. In the preface to *Don Quixote* this device is amusingly attacked, but it reappears in *Bentivolio and Urania* (1st ed.), *Pilgrim's Progress,* etc. Camus writes before *Agatonphile* (1623): "I *had* taken pains to put in the margin of the text the citations from authority (*des lieux de l'écriture*)....but....these fringes were more ample than the robe."

or woman rising or falling amid its turmoil, there resulted a rough unity. Vividly depicted though the scenes of *Gil Blas* and *Moll Flanders* are, these volumes were of yet greater significance in stressing a coherence which in the hands of Fielding became plot.

The third effect upon fiction sprang from the struggle for "purity." To the champions of chastity [42] we owe the "insipidity" of romance. Nor need we repeat what we have said of the men who stood for freedom and license—for "art for art's sake." The point is that in the war between the insipid purity for which the fashionable heroico-historical romance fought and the licentiousness which was advocated by its enemy, the novel of manners, there gradually arose writers who used what material they chose, and used it as the greatest geniuses always will use it—without abuse. One thinks, of course, of the *Princesse de Clèves,* of *Manon Lescaut,* of *Marianne,* of *Tom Jones,* of the *Nouvelle Héloise.* [43]

From time to time, perhaps,—the attentive reader will have noted in the course of the discussion of the chief purposes claimed by prose fiction, namely amusement and edification—that quotations have been used, quotations which might apply to other purposes. Such purposes were to give information, to depict life as it is, and to arouse emotion.

[42] Camus's remarks before *Dorothée* (1621) are another proof of his sincerity: "Therefore the song of Solomon will be rejectable (by the advocates of purity) because of *ses termes si tendre et....ses inventions si délicieuses*....but those who employ such terms for the service of modesty, why shall they be blamable?"

[43] Certain minor effects upon fiction may well be recalled or suggested. Both the relation of the insertion of moral comments to incoherence of structure and the development by Camus of the doctrinaire novel have been mentioned; surely the constant result of the doctrinaire novel has been to stultify the individual character into the type. Again, the service of the care-free *conte de fée* to the romantic revival of the eighteenth century should not be underestimated. In regard, finally, to the development of character, one passage illustrating the early use of "contrast" may be quoted: "They will see here four very different courts of great princes: one where reigns pride, insolence, and cruelty; another where there is talk only of valor, generosity, and other virtues necessary to conquerors; in another they will see only cowardice, voluptuousness, and debauchery; and in the other a wisdom so great that at its liking it dominates all the passions" (Desmaret's *Rosane,* 1639).

Until one has classified the remarkable ramifications of the first of these aims—the wish to impart information of some kind—one has no idea of its hold upon prose fiction. Indeed, the chief reason for analyzing this wish is that only thus can one fully understand the debt which is owed to the romances of Calprenède and of Mlle. de Scudéry by the slowly emerging theory of unity. For these, and these almost alone, kept themselves free, at least till Clélie, from the flotsam of the sea of instruction; yet, curiously enough, these romances are still spoken of as hopelessly adrift in a literary Sargasso. As we proceed from the less dangerous to the more astounding types of informational insertion, the value of their service becomes clear.

At once we may premise that instruction is not always advanced as an end,[44] and that, even when so advanced, it is somewhat difficult to separate from the social, religious, and moral aims.[45] The inculcation of proper behaviour, whether through advice to a courtier or in directions to a sailor, seems the purpose least detrimental to unity. "Read," advises Harvey in *Pierce's Supererogation,* "the Countess of Pembroke's *Arcadia*....for three things especially very notable for amorous courting....for sage counseling....for valorous fighting....and delightful pastime by way of pastoral exercise may pass for the fourth." Explains Le Sage before his *Aventures du Beauchène* (1732): "Another motive still incited him to this work, which he viewed as useful to society; he fancied that one would get an infinite pleasure (*saurait un gré infini*) from the minutest details that he gave of the encounters in which he had commanded; because, according to him, a post-captain and a simple shipmaster (*patron de barque*) ought to have as much prudence, address, and courage in their conduct as an admiral in his."

Discourses upon religious freedom, upon philosophy, and

[44] As in the *Telemachus,* e. g., which has no preface. Here, however, certain passages are key-notes to the purpose of the author. V. pp. 85; 161; 352.

[45] Confusion with other purposes is well illustrated in *Quevedo's Travels* (1684, and not by Quevedo), where we wander among many satirical lands, beholding all types of women, save those of Black-Swan-Mark, called the "Modestianians." (p. 104).

especially upon monarchy *versus* democracy have already been noted as the political meats of that "sweet nut," Barclay's *Argenis.*[46] In similar fashion and in accordance with expressed theory, the Utopian voyages, and the allegorical, religious, and informational romances insert much concerning government. Political aim, too, directs the *Medici* of Lenoble (1698): "I have chosen in famous authors the secret intrigues of the most famous conspiracies, and I have reduced them to small and specific histories (*histoires particulières*), in which besides the pleasure of the singular events mingled with love-intrigues, I hope there will be found all that political finesse (*politique la plus fine*)"...*Les Amours d'Anne d'Autriche,*[47] "in offering the following history" intends to "develop the great iniquitous mystery of the veritable origin of Louis XIV, disturber of public repose." Yet another political theme is that of patriotism. The *Astrée* is to celebrate, says d'Urfé, not an Italian Arcadia, but the banks of his cherished Lignon; Gerzan intended to cap his other romances (1626-1630) with a *Histoire Gauloise;* Calprenède states before Faramond that from all Europe and Asia he has chosen France for the theater of his action, in order that he might gratify national pride; and Bucholtz writes in the preface to *Hercules and Valiska* (1659): "I suspect that the love for my country has built this Christian German Hercules in my soul....without doubt our Germany also fostered in those times many brave heroes and princes, whose fame the envy of foreigners (*Unteutschen*) and the lack of historians suppressed and dedicated to oblivion."[48]

[46] V. pp. 95 (religious freedom); 454 (philosophy); 19; 65; 139; 206; 254; 355 (government).

[47] English translation of 1692. Cf. the preface to *Mémoires Secrètes pour servir a l'histoire de Perse* (173?), or that to *Sandras's Coligny* (1686).

[48] The back-handed strokes of Swift in *Gulliver's Travels* are little noticed. "I meddle not," we are told (Vol. II, p. 188), "with any party, but write without passion, prejudice, or ill-will against any man or number of men whatsoever." Yet once at least Swift unmasks (II, 192): "I had conceived a few scruples with relation to the distributive justice of princes upon those occasions." There follows a digression upon colonizing.

Other distinguishable goals of the aim to inform are the imparting of scientific and critical knowledge. For the latter desire such satirical romances as *Don Quixote, Lysis, Prince Fan-faredin* [49] may be consulted; for the former aim the *New Atlantis* of Bacon, the *Voyages to the Moon and to the Sun* of Cyrano de Bergerac, and the *Voyage to the World of Cartesius* (1692) afford sufficient proof. The *New Atlantis* has, however, no preface, and the views of the whimsical Cyrano are expressed only through his contemporary editors, Le Bret and Robauld. [50] Of Daniel's theory, already quoted, the lamentable result is that the really clever story occupies about one-sixth of a volume of 200 pages. Is it not clear that in a broad way we may characterize the instructional aim [51] as

[49] The prefaces of *Don Quixote* and the *Berger Extravagant* are not difficult of access. That to *Prince Fan-feredin* (1735) runs: "Behold it done. 'Tis a romance, and I who have written it....if this little work, the offspring of a sincere desire to connect good taste with good sense, answers my intentions by inspiring you, and all who read it, with a just aversion for the reading of romances, I will pardon you for having made me write it." V. also the preface to Wieland's *Don Sylvio de Rosalva* (1764).

[50] Ribault, prefacing in 1662 the *Empires of the Sun,* writes: "I can further say to you that he has perhaps believed that a *roman* should be a new method of treating important matters, which would be able to touch the taste of the minds of the century, and that he has written in the same sentiment that makes Lucretius defend himself for having made wisdom speak in verse."

[51] Certain miscellaneous aims of Gerzan and others will illustrate the situation very clearly. "In *l'Afriquaine,*" says Gerzan (1627-1628), "I discover two admirable masterpieces which great intellects have always concealed, of which the one acts powerfully for the conservation of the radical humidity (*l'humide radical*), and through the other the ladies can arrive at the height of beauty, be it for whiteness, be it for delicacy of skin.... In *l'Amériquaine* [I reveal] the savage mode of life of some peoples of the Indies, and the singularities of their country." So in *l'Asiatique* he intends an allegory "of our days," mixed, however, with information about ancient forms of worship: and in *l'Européane* he means to analyze "the evil-doing of a favorite." It is interesting that Gerzan reprinted some of this material in 1643 under the captions *La Triomphe des Dames* and *Le Grand Or Potable des Philosophes.* Head gives in a postscript to Vol. I of the *English Rogue* (1665) the following aim: "and (I) shall ere long discover what further progress he made in his cheats....not omitting the description of those places where-

disastrous—providing that we ignore some slight contributions to a local-color movement? [52]

Enough has been said upon the aims of entertainment, edification, and information. Never, as far as I know, did the two remaining purposes of prose fiction—the aim to depict life and the aim to arouse emotion—appear as the sole goals of any author. Nor need the former of these aims be followed minutely. Its most marked champions, Sorel, Furetière, Scarron, Le Sage, Defoe, and Marivaux have been taken up in the consideration of the dependence of the novel of manners upon comedy; and their by no means beneficial influence upon form, and their highly-desirable drift toward realism in incident, character, setting, and style may be seen in almost any of their productions. Not touched upon as yet, however, is the suggestion in Mareschal's *Chrysolite* (1627) of the importance of accuracy in the treatment of human emotion; his theory, unfortunately, does not reveal his amazing power as a psychologist. He merely says: "In others you will see only inflated balloons in the air which burst into atoms, monsters composed of a thousand contradictions....here I have put nothing save what a man can do, I hold myself in the limits of a private life——and I make use of antiquity [the scene is in Athens] only to lend glamour (*donner une couleur étrangère*) to the good or evil of our day." Of some importance, finally, is the promise of the historical romance and novel to picture faith-

in he perpetrated his rogueries." Ramsay in the *Travels of Cyrus* (1727) insists that he, like Xenophon, makes his hero travel in order to teach the reader history and geography. Even Mrs. Barker in *Exilius* (1715) timidly hopes that the peruser may "gain some gleanings of history." But one might heap up quotations of this kind. The effect upon structure is best seen in these lines from the *Euphues and his England,* pp. 162-163: "Gentlemen and gentlewomen, these Lenten evenings be long and a shame it were to go to bed; cold they are, therefore folly it were to walk abroad; to play at cards is common, at chess tedious, at dice unseemly, with Christmas games untimely. In my opinion....I would have some pastime that might be pleasant but not unprofitable, rare, but not without reasoning."

[52] The most promising contribution, Gerzan's *l'Amériquaine,* seems not to have been written. In Gomberville's *Polexandre,* Pt. V., pp. 1375-1377, there is a description of the Caribbeans.

fully the events of the past. This means very little in the romances; but in such works as Boyle's *Theodora and Didymus* (1686) in England and in the efforts of Sandras and Mme. d'Aulnoy in France (1686-1705), there is a true attempt to visualize earlier centuries. The idea itself had found perhaps its first utterance in 1569 in the forgery, which under the name of *Du Vraict et Parfait Amour* passed itself for a translation of a Greek novel: "the period, however, and the persons, of whom it makes mention, agree very well one with the other, which would make us judge the narration (*seraient juger*) rather a history than a fiction (*fable*)."

Not before 1713, as far as I know, was the Boccaccian theory of the arousing of the emotion of the reader again elaborated. There are, it is true, hints in various prefaces; and in *Clélie,* Mlle. de Scudéry worked emotion into her intricate theories.[53] Moreover, there must be material in some of the many imitations of the *Portugese Letters* (1669 seq.). Be this as it may, the preface to the *Aventures de M...* of 1713, which is attributed to Marivaux in the *Bibliothèque du Roi* of 1750, lays unmistakable emphasis upon the arousing of emotion: "The pity which the object excites when present, the inquietudes which it causes us, afflict the soul and make vexatious (*facheuses*) impressions. It is softened; but it really suffers. The emotion is painful (*le sentiment est triste*); whereas the simple recital, however frightful it may be, if it excites pity, carries into the soul only a compassionate interest without grief (*douleur*). One sighs with those who seem to us to sigh; but as their evils are only feigned, the moved soul (*l'âme émue*) gets a pleasure out of its sensibility, in protecting itself through reason from veritable sadness, which ought to occupy it only at the real presence (*réalité*) of misfortunes."

We have done, now, with the last of the aims of prose fiction as these found expression from 1579-1740; let us cast at our analysis of them a bird's-eye glance. The aim of amusement, we observe, is much less voiced that that of edification; yet, as we draw nearer to the great writers of the mid-18th

[53] Space forbids analysis here. The matter will be treated *in extenso* in my forthcoming book.

century, we note here and there the stirring of recalcitrants who follow the banner of "delight" and *"volupté."* Aside from amusement, there are visible many serious aims. There appears an occasional volume motivated by desire for definite social reforms; upon the standards of a shoal of *voyages imaginaires* is inscribed "return to nature"; idealizing and controversial fictions of religious bent are not uncommon. More powerful by far than all these minor aims is the great "moral" purpose: for in its service are bandied arguments *pro* and *con* upon the use of the "horrible example"; through its influence are exploited characters who represent a single unalterable virtue and characters who evolve to higher planes or sink to lower ones; under its pressure is born a heated discussion concerning purity of scene and of phrase. Nor do the aims of amusement and edification fill the entire field before us. "Instruction" is finding a potent auxiliary in fiction; by the latter's allurements men are being won to listen to philosophy, history, economics, geography, physical science, criticism, and even fashion. The "depiction of life" has many adherents, all engaged in speculation as to what life "is," both now and in the past, both within and without the human microcosmos. Even such an apparently aesthetic and modern aim as the mere "arousing of emotion" is present in a remote corner of the plain. More significant, however, than *any* championing of this or that aim of fiction is the result of the theorizing upon narrative substance and form. The wish for variety of material and the intention of presenting character in order to satirize it both make strongly for incoherence of form; so does the insertion of moral and informational comment within a given narrative. On the other hand, the employment of an autobiographical method of relation by authors who seek to be believed, the reproduction of the life-story of a rising or falling hero, and the dislike of many of the romancers for matter not directly narrative, work to preserve unity. Quite apart from the problem of structure, the desire to depict the world as it is, is breaking a path for later realists; and the struggle for purity is pointing the way to the genuinely psychological novel and the decent but virile novel of manners.

University of Illinois. ARTHUR J. TIEJE.